

Amtd. dated February 16, 2006

Reply to Office Action mailed December 15, 2005

REMARKS

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed December 15, 2005. By the present amendment, the Applicants have amended claim 2. It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently pending in the application, namely claims 1-18, do not introduce new subject matter, are fully supported by the application and are patentable over the prior art. Prompt and favorable consideration of these claims is earnestly sought.

In the Office Action, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for reciting an element without sufficient antecedent basis. The Applicant has amended claim 2 to correct a typographical error and provide sufficient antecedent basis for the recitation of "a plurality of fasteners." Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of the Office Action has been overcome and claim 2 is now in condition for allowance.

In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 1-18 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 5,582,616. In response thereto, the Applicants hereby submit a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c). Please charge the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d) to Deposit Account 21-0550.

TWO (2) COPIES OF THIS SHEET ARE ENCLOSED.